FILED 1 STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL JAYNE KIM, No. 174614 2 DEC 1 2 2012 CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL 3 JOSEPH R. CARLUCCI, No. 172309 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE DEPUTY CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL SAN FRANCISCO 4 SUSAN I. KAGAN, No. 214209 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL SUSAN CHAN, No. 233229 SENIOR TRIAL COUNSEL 6 SUZAN J. ANDERSON, No. 160559 SENIOR TRIAL COUNSEL 7 180 Howard Street San Francisco, California 94105-1639 8 Telephone: (415) 538-2209 9 10 11 STATE BAR COURT 12 HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO 13 14 In the Matter of: Case No. 12-O-16562 NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES 15 RODNEY KENT WORREL. No. 51857, kwiktag* 152 143 819 16 17 A Member of the State Bar **NOTICE - FAILURE TO RESPOND!** 18 IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE 19 WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL: 20 (1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENTERED; 21 (2) YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED TO INACTIVE AND YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW; 22 (3) YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN THESE PROCEEDINGS UNLESS YOU MAKE A TIMELY MOTION 23 AND THE DEFAULT IS SET ASIDE, AND; (4) YOU SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL DISCIPLINE. 24 SPECIFICALLY, IF YOU FAIL TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET ASIDE OR VACATE YOUR DEFAULT, THIS COURT WILL ENTER AN 25 ORDER RECOMMENDING YOUR DISBARMENT WITHOUT FURTHER HEARING OR PROCEEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET SEQ., 26 RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA. 27

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

28

2	<u>JURISDICTION</u>					
3	1. RODNEY KENT WORREL ("Respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in					
4	the State of California on January 5, 1072, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges,					
5	and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.					
6	<u>COUNT ONE</u>					
7 8	Case No. 12-O-16562 Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A) [Failure to Perform with Competence]					
9	2. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 3-110(A), by					
10	intentionally, recklessly, or repeatedly failing to perform legal services with competence, as					
11	follows:					
12	3. On or about April 4, 2011, George Kutnerian on behalf of Apollo Prep, LLC					
13	("Kutnerian"), employed Respondent to file a patent application. On that date, Kutnerian paid					
14	Respondent \$8,000 in advanced legal fees.					
15	4. In or about January 2012, Kutnerian telephoned Respondent to inquire about the					
16	status of the patent application. Respondent informed Kutnerian that he would have the patent					
17	application completed within two months.					
18	5. In or about March 2012, Kutnerian telephoned Respondent to again inquire about the					
19	status of the patent application. Respondent informed Kutnerian that he would have the patent					
20	application completed in one more month.					
21	6. In or about April 2012, Kutnerian telephoned Respondent to again inquire about the					
22	status of the patent application. Respondent informed Kutnerian that he would have the patent					
23	application completed by the end of May 2012.					
24	7. In or about May 2012, when Kutnerian telephoned Respondent regarding the status of					
25	the patent application, Respondent informed Kutnerian that he would have it completed by the					
26	end of June.					
27	·					
28						

The State Bar of California alleges:

1

NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

1	<u>COUNT THREE</u>			
2 3	Case No. 12-O-16562 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m) [Failure to Respond to Client Inquiries]			
4	17. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(m), by			
5	failing to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a client in a matter in which			
6	Respondent had agreed to provide legal services, as follows:			
7	18. The allegations of Count One are incorporated by reference herein.			
8	19. Between in or about July 5, 2012, and July 24, 2012, Kutnerian called and left at			
9	least four voicemail messages for Respondent, requesting the status of the patent application.			
10	Respondent received the voicemail messages.			
11	20. At no time did Respondent return the voicemail messages left by Kutnerian between			
12	in or about July 5, 2012, and July 24, 2012, or provide an update on the status of the patent			
13	application.			
14	21. By failing to respond to Kutnerian's telephone messages regarding the status of the			
15	patent application, Respondent failed to respond promptly to reasonable status inquiries of a			
16	client in a matter in which Respondent had agreed to provide legal services.			
17	<u>COUNT FOUR</u>			
18 19	Case No. 12-O-16562 Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i) [Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]			
20	22. Respondent wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i), by			
21	failing to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent, a			
22	follows:			
23	23. The allegations of Count One are incorporated by reference herein.			
24	24. On or about September 10, 2012, the State Bar opened an investigation, Case			
25	Number 12-O-16562, pursuant to a complaint made by Kutnerian against Respondent.			
26	25. On or about October 3, 2012 and October 25, 2012, the Stare Bar sent Respondent a			
27	letter regarding the allegations made by Kutnerian and asking Respondent to respond in writing			
28				

-4-NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES

1	to those allegations. The letters were placed in sealed envelopes and properly mailed to					
2	Respondent's official membership address of record. Respondent received the letters.					
3	26. To date, Respondent has failed to cooperate in any manner in this investigation and					
4	failed to provide a written response to any of the State Bar's letters requesting that he respond to					
5	the allegations of misconduct being investigated by the State Bar in the Kutnerian matter.					
6	27. By failing to provide a written response to the allegations in the Kutnerian matter or					
7	otherwise cooperating in the investigation of the Kutnerian matter, Respondent failed to					
8	cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against Respondent.					
9						
10	NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!					
11	YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE					
12	SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO					
13	THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT.					
14						
15	ADECIMIENTED BY THE COURT.					
16	NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!					
17	IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS					
18	INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND					
19	PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10.					
20	Respectfully submitted,					
21	THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL					
22						
23						
24	DATED: December 12, 2012 By: SVZAN/I ANDERSON					
25	Senior Trial Counsel					
26						
27						

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

by

U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL and U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL

CASE NUMBER(s): 12-O-16562

California, 180 Howard Street, S	over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the with an Francisco, California 94105, declare that: selow, I caused to be served a true copy of the within docume		ess and place of employment is the State Bar of					
NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES								
By U.S. First-Class Mail: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the of San Francisco.								
By Overnight Delivery: (CCP §§ 1013(c) and 1013(d)) - I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery by the United Parcel Service ('UPS'								
By Fax Transmission: (CCP §§ 1013(e) and 1013(f)) Based on agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed herein below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. The original record of the fax transmission is retained on file and available upon request.								
By Electronic Service: (CCP § 1010.6) Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the person(s) at the electronic addresses listed herein below. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.								
(for U.S. First-Class Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing at San Francisco, addressed to: (see below)								
(for Certified Mail) in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing as certified mail, return receipt requested, Article No.: 7196 9008 9111 6623 1156 at San Francisco, addressed to: (see below)								
(for Overnight Delivery) together with a copy of this declaration, in an envelope, or package designated by UPS, Tracking No.: addressed to: (see below)								
Person Served	Business-Residential Address	Fax Number	Courtesy Copy via First Class mail to:					
Rodney K. Worrel	Worrel & Worrel 2109 W Bullard #121 Fresno, California 93711-1258 (Via U.S. Mail and Certified Mail/RRR)	Electronic Address	Rodney K. Worrel c/o Mark D. Magness, Esq. Gilmore, Wood, Vinnard & Magness, P.C. 10 Riverpark Place East, Suite 240 Fresno, California 93720					
via inter-office mail regu	larly processed and maintained by the State Bar of	f California addressed to:						
	N/A							
I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and overnight delivery by the United Parcel Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Bar of California's practice, correspondence collected and processed by the State Bar of California would be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day, and for overnight delivery, deposited with delivery fees paid or provided for, with UPS that same day.								
I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope or package is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing contained in the affidavit.								
I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California, on the date shown below.								
DATED: December								